

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Reconsideration of this application is respectfully requested.

It is noted that the office action summary page is incomplete with respect to item 12 acknowledging applicants' earlier filing of a certified copy of the priority document. However, such filing is noted on the notice of acceptance dated July 5, 2006. The Examiner is respectfully requested to confirm that the USPTO files are properly updated, if necessary, to acknowledge receipt of applicants' certified priority document.

The rejection of claims 1-40 under 35 U.S.C. §102 as allegedly anticipated by Srinivasa '189 is respectfully traversed.

The above amendment to independent claims 1 and 12 is merely for the purpose of ensuring that these claims are properly interpreted. For example, the final step/means as earlier recited requires providing a user model based on rules derived in relation to a plurality of clusters. The above amendment makes explicit what is at least therefore implicit in clarifying that the previous step requires rules to be derived in relation to a plurality of clusters.

Preferred embodiments of the present invention involve deriving a "user model" from event records stored electronically in an individual user's electronic diary or in some such means. The user model so-derived would not itself be the individual user's electronic diary, but is something that may be used in order to generate and suggest

potential "additional" event records that may be used to update the individual user's electronic diary.

Of course, "individual-user-specific" records are not directly reflected in the independent claims. Similarly, derivation of a user model that may be used to update a user's electronic diary, rather than to derive a user model that is the user's electronic diary, is also not reflected in the independent claims. It is worth noting, however, that, even for the independent claims, the asserted equations that the Examiner has made between aspects of Srinivasa's technique and those of the presently claimed invention do not involve like-for-like correspondences. As a result, it appears that the Examiner has failed to appreciate the many differences between the presently claimed invention and Srinivasa.

The Examiner refers to the "user's electronic calendar" in Srinivasa, stating that this is regarded as corresponding to the "model" in the applicants' claims. There is nothing preventing the Examiner from suggesting such a correspondence, but it should be borne in mind that the "user model" according to (preferred) embodiments of the present invention would not be the "user's electronic calendar" itself. This is, in fact, the source from which event records are obtained before being used according to the claimed invention.

Instead, the user model according to (preferred) embodiments of the present invention is something that is derived for the purpose of being of use in a subsequent process of updating the user's electronic calendar.

It is not clear whether the Examiner has fully appreciated this difference and, in itself, it is not something that distinguishes the invention as defined by the independent claims from Srinivasa. But it does not appear that the Examiner has been consistent in regarding the "user's electronic calendar" in Srinivasa as corresponding to the "model" in all of his analyses of the claims to the present invention.

With Srinivasa's technique, event records found from, for example, the internet in general, are identified, analyzed and used in order to create actual event records for incorporation into a "user's electronic calendar" (which the Examiner has indicated he is regarding as corresponding to "the model"). It is these actual event records (and thus an updated "user's electronic calendar") that are "derived" in Srinivasa, rather than a model of the type to which the present invention relates – which is for use in generating and suggesting potential event records for possible incorporation into a user's electronic diary.

The above issues are worth bearing in mind when considering what Srinivasa teaches in comparison below with the invention as claimed, even in the broader independent claims.

A fundamental difference between the method as claimed in applicants' independent claim 12 and Srinivasa's technique stems from the fact that the claimed method involves "identifying...", "determining..." and "analyzing..." steps that are all performed in relation to "sequences (of event records)", whereas Srinivasa's technique simply involves analysis of records of individual events. The only specific mention of "sequences", "series" or the like in Srinivasa appears to be that in paragraph [0040], but this doesn't suggest analysis steps corresponding to those set out in claim 12.

The Examiner appears to have taken note that claim 12 refers to "sequences of event records", but only in relation to the first step (i.e. the "identifying..." step). After that, the excerpts of Srinivasa that the Examiner refers to in relation to the steps of the claimed method relate to steps performed only at a level of analysis in respect of records of individual events, rather than steps performed in respect of sequences of event records.

Looking at this in more detail, the Examiner refers to paragraphs [0033], [0035] and [0036] in relation to the introductory sub-paragraph, the "identifying..." step and the "determining..." step of applicants' claim 12, and to paragraph [0077] in relation to the "analyzing..." step of applicants' claim 12. It is accepted that these Srinivasa paragraphs involve finding a plurality of events that may be of interest to a user (according to a category of events, such as "golf events", for example), and it appears reasonable even to regard such a plurality of events as "a sequence of events". But if event records

relating to such a plurality of events are to be regarded as corresponding to the "sequence of event records" referred to in applicants' claim 12 (as apparently suggested by the Examiner), the analysis (according to Srinivasa's technique) of the event records so-found would need to involve analysis (according to each of the "identifying..." and "determining..." steps of claim 12) of a **plurality of such "pluralities of event records"**.

In fact, the analysis according to Srinivasa's technique of the event records so-found involves analysis of a plurality of individual event records, each relating to individual events in the "sequence" of events (i.e., the events identified as being of the same category), rather than analysis of a plurality of such pluralities of event records.

The Examiner has noted blocks 416a, 416b and 416c in Figure 13 of Srinivasa, which each relate to clustering by event component. It should be noted, however, that the clusters in this context are clusters of records of individual events, rather than clusters of sequences of records of individual events. Furthermore, the following steps (420 and 422) result in the selection of one cluster as the "winning cluster". While the explanation in paragraph [0076] and the final block (422) of Figure 13 appear to be at odds with one another (the explanation states that "the winning cluster" is treated as "the final leader", whereas the figure suggests that the "leader of the winning cluster" is treated as "the final leader"), neither of these alternatives suggests that rules derived relating to sequences from each of a plurality of clusters of any sort are used in any subsequent analysis so as to derive a "user model" of any sort.

It will thus be understood that despite what is shown in or implied by Srinivasa's Figure 13 in conjunction with the description, his technique does not involve steps corresponding to the "determining..." step of applicants' claim 12, which involves determining a plurality of "sequence clusters", each of which comprises a plurality of related sequences, and the "analyzing..." step of applicants' claim 12, which involves analysis of sequences (i.e., sequences of event records) in each of a plurality of such sequence clusters (i.e., clusters of related sequences, each of which themselves are sequences of event records) so as to derive rules (i.e., relating to the sequences of each of the plurality of clusters). The "user model" provided in the final step of claim 12 is based on rules so derived (i.e., relating to the sequences of each of a plurality of clusters), rather than rules derived simply by analyzing a plurality of individual event records – no such "user model" is provided in Srinivasa's technique.

As for independent claim 1, the Examiner has simply referred back to the comments provided for independent method claim 12. Accordingly, the above discussion of distinctions for Srinivasa with respect to method claim 12 equally apply to independent apparatus claim 1.

Given such already discussed deficiencies of Srinivasa with respect to independent claims 1 and 12, it is not necessary at this time to detail additional deficiencies of Srinivasa with respect to other aspects of the rejected claims. Suffice it to note that, as a matter of law, it is not possible to establish a *prima facie* case of

Behnam AZVINE, *et al.*
Serial No. 10/568,183
August 23, 2010


anticipation unless a single cited prior art reference teaches each and every feature of each rejected claim.

Accordingly, this entire application is now believed to be in allowable condition, and a formal notice to that effect is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

NIXON & VANDERHYE P.C.

By:


Larry S. Nixon
Reg. No. 25,640

LSN:lef

901 North Glebe Road, 11th Floor
Arlington, VA 22203-1808
Telephone: (703) 816-4000
Facsimile: (703) 816-4100